

Dear Mr. Bradlee,

11/25/83

Because I still have promises to keep, although with many fewer miles to go before I sleep (because of serious illness and my 70 years), I write you with a complaint not against you but against the Post. When my wife retypes it I will enclose a copy of what I am sending to your op ed page editor, about Dan Schorr's piece that I hope, upon examination and reflection, will not make you proud.

While what I have written will have to speak for itself, to illustrate the gross unfairness of both the piece and its publication, I personalize. I also do this because checking me out is easy and simple for you.

Schorr begins by lumping (if not also condemning) all critics of the official solution of the assassination of President Kennedy as idle theorists and all work as "a spate of conspiracy theories." It is not possible than anyone qualified to be any kind of editor on the Post does not know other and better than this.

I am one who not only does not theorize whodunits (as you will not Schorr does), I oppose those who do.

My work is of a magnitude and ~~I believe~~ an accuracy you will, I believe, have difficulty finding duplicated in any field and on any subject. My FOIA efforts, including present-making FOIA litigation not reported in the Post, results in my having - and making freely available to all, including those with whom I do not agree - about a half-million pages of once-withheld records. In the course of this, I was responsible for the 1974 amending of the FOIA's investigatory-files exemption, also not reported in the Post, with all the public benefit of which you cannot be entirely unaware.

If I would not have elected it, I have been forced into a public role and to the best of my ability I serve it fully and impartially. I have never had a single complaint about accuracy, in either my writing, which means seven books, or the information I provide, including to any and all reporters, even those I know will describe me as a "chicken farmer" instead of a former investigative reporter, Senate

investigator and editor and intelligence analyst.

In meeting this public responsibility and serving this public role without regard to personal interest, you can easily find, for example, that long before I published the 1/21/64 Commission executive session transcript ^{referred to} I gave Bill Claiborne a xerox of it in New York, when he chided me for understating its significance. I have not yet published the Marine Corps proof that Oswald had ~~crypto~~ crypto clearance, which required top secret clearance, but when I received it I offered it to your national desk. Thereafter, when it appeared to be pertinent, I phoned and offered it to the national desk at least one more time, both times 4 to 5 years ago.

Whatever you may think of my writing, and I doubt you have had time or interest to really familiarize yourself with it, it has stood the test of time and minute scrutiny. It is anything but conspiracy theorizing. And whatever you may think of my perseverance in so many FOIA suits, the one thing you will not find in them is much theorizing. It ought be apparent that an undertaking of this magnitude and cost cannot be and was not for any kind of personal profit and did involve not inconsiderable sacrifices.

While nobody else has come close to an inquiry of this cost, depth and magnitude, you must certainly know that there are others ^{or} who also are not either self-seekers of conspiracy theorists.

Particularly because the Post is read and credited by the judges who sit on my cases and the government lawyers who stonewall them, can you see how entirely, and I think inexcuseably, unfair the Schorr piece is, quite aside from the nature of the rest of its content? Even hurtful to what the press ought not want to hurt?

After 20 years, is it not, really, long past time for the Post to confront its shibboleths and prejudices and treat this subject as it treats any other? And to at least be conscious of the possibility of unfairness and injury to many decent people who have assumed the responsibility of good citizenship in a representative society? I ask nothing of you but thought, but I do hope you will want to find some way of undoing this harm.

Sincerely, Harold Weisberg

